

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 STEPHEN GARCIA,

No. 2:24-cv-2532-TLN-SCR

12 Plaintiff,

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

13 v.

14 GEORGE ROBINSON, et al.,

15 Defendants.

17

18 Plaintiff Stephen Garcia is proceeding pro se in this action, which was referred to the
19 undersigned in accordance with Local Rule 302(c)(21) and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). On September
20 18, 2024, Plaintiff filed a complaint and a motion to proceed in forma pauperis (“IFP”). ECF
21 Nos. 1 and 2. On December 3, 2024, this Court screened the complaint per the screening process
22 required by 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) and found the complaint was deficient in that it did not
23 comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8. ECF No. 3. The complaint did not contain a
24 short and plain statement setting forth the basis for federal jurisdiction or showing Plaintiff’s
25 entitlement to relief. ECF No. 3 at 3-4. The Court’s order provided in relevant part that Plaintiff
26 shall have 30 days to file an amended complaint, and such amended complaint “must include a
27 sufficient jurisdictional statement and comply with Rule 8.” *Id.* at 5. The Order warned that
28

1 failure to comply may result in a recommendation that the action be dismissed. *Id.* More than 30
2 days have passed, and Plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint.

3 Good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that **Plaintiff shall show cause, in**
4 **writing, within 14 days**, why the failure to file an amended complaint should not result in a
5 recommendation that this case be dismissed based on lack of jurisdiction and/or for failure to state
6 a claim. Plaintiff may respond by filing an amended complaint that complies with the Court's
7 prior order. If Plaintiff fails to respond, the court will recommend dismissal of this case.

8 SO ORDERED.

9 DATED: January 13, 2025



10
11 SEAN C. RIORDAN
12 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28